



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

reason that the seventy guns which our government now has on these naval militia training ships to the one gun which they have upon a small and insignificant boat, might easily be used, in case of an emergency, for a descent upon Canadian shores. There is little doubt that the suspicion thus awakened, though our government has given assurance that it has no intention of abandoning the Rush-Bagot agreement, has been at least a powerful indirect force in inducing the Dominion government to take the step which it has in creating the nucleus of a navy.

Another of the influences, probably the most potent one, which have led the Canadian government to take this fatal step, is that of the Imperial Defense Conference held in London a little while ago. This conference was a most adroit move of the British imperialists, and the great self-governing colonies, dazzled by the glory of the Empire as it was pictured to them by the imperial big-navy promoters, fell into the trap set for them. Canada, instead of contributing ships directly to the British navy, has, in order to maintain the form of local independence and self-government, undertaken to create a navy of her own, which shall at her own discretion be at the service of the British Imperial government in case of emergency. But in reality the new navy, when built, will henceforth be in fact, if not in form, an integral part of the Imperial government's naval force, and the alarms and panics which cause feverish naval increase in British waters will have a similar effect in the Canadian. If the Canadian people, the farmers and working men, who constitute the body of the citizens and have the greatest stake in the future well-being of the Dominion, do not fully realize the situation immediately, they will in coming years have to pay a heavy penalty for the thoughtlessness and unwisdom of the course which their government is now taking. It is probably still within their power to prevent the further progress of the calamity which is befalling them, if they begin at once. Will they do this, and thus maintain their splendid government as a shining example to all the world of what a great people may be and do by keeping itself free from the entanglements of international suspicion, enmity and rivalry in the instruments of death? They ought to do it.

### The Supposed Errors of Peace Advocates.

One of the peculiar weaknesses of the critics of peace advocates is their almost universal failure to find out, before they criticise, what are the real positions taken by peace workers. The ignorance displayed in this regard is most disappointing, and makes it clearly evident that these critics as a rule have not been much in the company of peace workers, have rarely, if ever, attended the peace congresses, and have got their information, or rather their misinformation, largely from the scrappy and imperfect notices found in the newspapers.

These reflections have been awakened by an article in the *Independent* of November 4 on "Errors of Peace Advocates," by Prof. Amos S. Hershey of the Indiana State University. Professor Hershey is usually a well-informed and careful writer, and in the article referred to shows clearly that he means to be fair. But he has fallen into a number of errors in his interpretation of the positions of peace advocates. It is possible that individual peace advocates of extremist tendencies might be found of whom all that he says is true. But we naturally suppose him to be speaking of the general body of peace workers, the peace party of the world, who are responsible for the peace programs brought before the public and before the responsible public officials. Of this peace party much that he writes is far from exact.

His first criticism is that peace advocates "demand that our text-books on history be emasculated in the interest of peace." The development of his thought shows that Professor Hershey means by this emasculation the entire removal of wars from the history text-books. The responsible peace advocates have never asked for any such thing. They have only urged that the relative space given to wars should be greatly reduced, and that the details of campaigns, battles and victories which inflame the child's imagination and pervert his spirit, which inculcate false ideas of patriotism and make fighting and killing seem a manly and glorious thing, should be eliminated. They do not ignore the fact that war has played a prominent part in history and must therefore have a proper share of the historian's attention. They do insist that war history should not be so taught as to keep alive in the coming generations the savage, brutal, tyrannical instincts of the past, and thus make human society a prey to this dreadful scourge forever.

There is not time here to examine in detail Professor Hershey's somewhat astonishing theory that because boys have fighting instincts inherited from the past, their education must be so directed as to give satisfaction to these instincts. On that theory all other passions and instincts would have to be gratified also, and the moral progress of the race would be impossible. Every true system of education seeks to enthrone intelligence, reason, conscience and goodwill, and not to keep alive and active whatever animal instincts and selfish propensities may have come up from the past. If the Old Testament appeals more strongly to the imagination of boys than the New, which peace advocates are sorry to have to confess is too often the case, we must train a generation of whom the opposite will be true. A limited amount of experience — for the experiment has not yet been largely tried — seems to indicate that a generation of children may be brought up to whom brutal fighting will be loathsome and practically impossible.

Nor, again, do the responsible peace advocates "refuse to face the world as it really is." That is exactly what they are doing. They know well that "we still live in the midst of peril and warfare"; "that life is still a struggle, etc." If they did not know this they would not be in the business of peace-making at all. If there were no more any war or danger of war in the world, any conflict, any misunderstanding, any unfriendliness among the nations, they would consider their mission accomplished, would disband their societies and turn to other work. But they cannot follow Professor Hershey's hinted advice and uphold war at the same time that they advocate peace. They cannot advise that our nation greatly increase its armament because there are possibilities of war, when they know that the peril and risk of conflict is only increased by such a course and the whole situation made worse. They cannot play fast and loose with the great object of their mission. It is their duty, as they conceive it, not to face the world as it really is and help it to remain as it is, but to face it for its transformation, to help it to evolve out the bad and evolve in the good. Because the forty-six nations, "one and all, recognize war as a legitimate means of settling serious disputes among themselves," Professor Hershey would have the advocates of peace do the same, even at this late day. But they do not so conceive their duty. They believe that the world is already so advanced ethically and rational methods of adjusting controversies so recognized that war should no longer be allowed to be a legitimate means of settling disputes. It is their business to try to change the views of the forty-six nations, "one and all," on this subject, not to confirm them in their errors and thus keep back the cause of peace indefinitely.

Nor again is it a "common error of peace advocates that arbitration is the sole and sovereign preventive of war." Professor Hershey has here drawn a good deal on his imagination. Peace advocates know, as well as he, that diplomacy has prevented wars, and that it is today becoming more and more an instrument of good understanding and friendly adjustment. The whole idea of commissions of inquiry originated with peace advocates, and they have always urged the importance of friendly negotiation, good offices and mediation. They have, of course, laid special stress on arbitration, and its extraordinary success during the past twenty years, during which no less than one hundred and twenty-five controversies have been settled by this method, justifies them in laying even greater emphasis upon it at the present time. In this the Hague Conferences have followed them. The peace advocates are well aware that there are still, unfortunately, questions of difference which nations will not refer to arbitration. They believe, however, that at the present time no question of

difference ought to be reserved from arbitration, except possibly those which involve the national existence, and these ought always to be considered in another category than that of arbitration. Arbitration assumes independent nations standing over against each other and respecting each other's independence and rights. This assumption allowed, there are certainly no questions of difference to-day between independent nations which are not capable of honorable and satisfactory settlement by arbitration. Even justice and humanity, which Professor Hershey declares sometimes justify war, and give rise to questions which are incapable of arbitration, can easily be shown to suffer more than they ever gain from war. Every war, no matter what end of justice or humanity it is waged for, draws in its train certain kinds of frightful injustice and inhumanity which are inseparable from warfare. It will be time enough to say that arbitration cannot be applied to such questions when it has once been tried and found wanting. It has not yet been tried. At any rate, it will be admitted that friendly negotiation might find a great field for service in this direction. In the case of General Weyler in Cuba, to which Professor Hershey refers, it is now well known that friendly negotiation carried on by President McKinley and Minister Woodford was just on the point of cutting the Gordian knot when Congress and the country were stampeded into war by certain newspapers and members of the National House and Senate. Are peace advocates wrong in urging that questions of justice and humanity be handled in such a way as not to produce deeper injustices and wrongs, and propagate further the wild and lawless system by which it has been sought in the past to remedy injustice?

Professor Hershey comes only a little nearer doing justice to peace advocates in his treatment of the symptoms and the causes of war. Very few peace workers of any standing have ever confused the symptoms and the causes of war. It is quite true, as he says, that the great armaments of the time are symptoms and expressions of the diseased and abnormal conditions of international relations. Peace advocates know and have always known this. They have always, to the best of their intelligence, sought out, exposed and done what they could do to eradicate the fundamental, underlying causes of war. But the great armaments are more than symptoms. They are an essential part of the diseased and abnormal condition of international relations. They are likewise the most powerful single agency in keeping alive and active this diseased condition. Commercial imperialism, which Dr. Hershey considers, and with much reason, the chief cause of war in our time, relies almost entirely on the great armaments and would make a very poor show without them. It is from these two

points of view that peace advocates condemn the system of armaments and urge an arrest of the mad rivalry of the nations in increasing them. They are convinced that it will be next to impossible to do away with the underlying causes of war so long as these causes are kept alive and intensified by the great armies and the big navies. It is very difficult to put out a conflagration, no matter how many streams of water are directed upon it, so long as hostile hands are incessantly pouring oil into the flames. The friends of peace feel that all the causes of war ought to be opposed and sought to be eradicated at the same time.

Peace advocates are very glad to find such able men as Professor Hershey agreeing and coöperating with them so heartily in the effort to soften the racial antipathies which are one of the root causes of misunderstanding and war. This has been a prominent feature of their propaganda from the earliest days of the movement. None are more outspoken than they against the aggressive spirit of commercial imperialism, against the doctrine of the right of conquest and against international disrespect, contempt and nagging, whatever form these may take. They are almost the only men just now in Great Britain and Germany who are laboring heroically and with abundant self-sacrifice in the organization of international visits, etc., to try to remove the misunderstanding and the ugly antipathy between these two peoples.

In his last bit of advice Professor Hershey shows himself to be absolutely in accord with the responsible peace advocates in what has been one of the most important practical features of their propaganda, "the organization of the world on a federal basis." From the days of Worcester, Ladd, Burritt, Sumner and Jay, of Cobden, Bright and Richard, down to the present year, the peace party has urged, in season and out of season, the establishment of a Congress or Parliament of Nations and an International High Court of Justice, with such an executive power as time may prove to be necessary and practicable. The periodical Peace Conferences at The Hague have been in no small measure the fruit of their many decades of labor, and in support of the work and the development and perfecting of these Conferences, they have aroused and concentrated public opinion to a degree which is very little known, even to the most friendly and sympathetic of their critics. In this direction they hope to do much better work hereafter than they have done in the past.

---

On December 1, in the Canadian Parliament at Ottawa, Sir Wilfrid Laurier, the Dominion Premier, made a strong plea for the maintenance of the Rush-Bagot agreement of 1817 as to armament on the Great Lakes. This famous agreement ought now to be turned into a permanent formal treaty.

## Editorial Notes.

Monument to  
Sir William  
Randal Cremer.

On the 30th of October, in the West Hampstead Cemetery, a monument to the late Sir William Randal Cremer was unveiled by Lord Weardale, president of the British group of the Interparliamentary Union, which was founded by Mr. Cremer. The monument, a four-sided column of Aberdeen granite, bears an inscription which closes with the two following statements:

"Sir William Randal Cremer promoted many fraternal international demonstrations of workmen, and carried in Parliament a motion in favor of a treaty of arbitration with the United States, which, like many such treaties, is now in operation.

"Sir William Randal Cremer was for thirty-eight years secretary of the International Arbitration League. His enduring monument is the Interparliamentary Union, which he founded in 1888, whose object is the abolition of war."

A large gathering assembled to witness the ceremony. Speaking of the taking away of Mr. Cremer at the moment when increasing armaments are casting a shadow upon the aspirations of the friends of peace, Lord Weardale said:

"He, if he had happily still been with us, would not have been dismayed. His dauntless faith in the sacred truth of the cause of which he was the fearless and distinguished advocate, and in the ultimate awakening of the conscience of mankind, would have led him to resolutely maintain with all his strenuous nature that this was but the darkness before the dawn. He would have discerned the gleams of coming light in the encircling gloom. His confidence would have been strong, based upon his intimate acquaintance with the perhaps slow-moving, but ever-expanding force of educated public opinion amongst the toiling masses. He would have taken his part in spreading knowledge and in teaching how overwhelmingly great are the burdens which constantly augmenting armaments impose upon the world. He would have combated the insidious but continuous growth of militarism. He would have continued to point out a nobler direction for civilized effort than the insane rivalry of nations in vain-glorious equipment and the wanton waste of blood and treasure involved in war. He would have looked forward, and as we believe not in vain, to that hour when humanity would shake itself free from ancient and barbarous superstition, and when the various peoples of the universe would demand that their rulers, under whose bidding they have been too long ranged in rival hosts ever ready for the deadly fray, should seek by other and more Christian paths and through the agency of some well-ordered system of international justice to sincerely promote the definite triumph of the principles of fraternity and concord."

Pan-European  
Bureau.

Alfred H. Fried, editor of *Die Friedens-Warte* (Vienna IX/2, 5 Widerhofergasse), has proposed the organization of a Pan-European Bureau, modeled after the Bureau of the